

REMARKS

Claims 1-14 are now pending in the application. Claims 1-2, 4-7, and 9-10 have been amended. Claims 13-14 are new. Support for the foregoing amendments can be found throughout the specification, drawings, and claims as originally filed. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-6 and 8-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kentish et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,778,417). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant has amended claims 1-2, 4-7, and 9-10 to more clearly point out the claimed subject matter. Claim 1 calls for that “a deciding unit, responsive to at least one authorization parameter that is a predetermined subset of the respective parameters and that is authorized to be set by the simple control unit, for applying the at least one authorization parameter to restrict setting, on the mixing unit, a plurality of parameters indicated in the certain detailed setting information and associated with the mixing process.” Applicant submits that Kentish fails to anticipate these limitations.

The Examiner appears to consider a) panel (10) of Kentish as analogous to the claimed simple control unit and b) control processor (60C) and signal processor (70) as analogous to the claimed mixing unit. Kentish states

[t]he scanning processor passes information indicative of the control positions to a panel processor 60P via a dual port random access memory (RAM), a switch first-in-first-out (FIFO) register 40 and a fader FIFO 50. The panel processor 60P communicates with a control processor 60C, which in turn

controls the operation of a signal processor 70.

Kentish col. 4, Ins. 27-32. In other words, the signal processor (70) and control processor (60C) act on all the control information received from the panel (10). Kentish, however, does not appear to disclose that control processor (60C) and signal processor (70) restrict the control information received from the panel (10) to be applied to the mixing process based on a set of predetermined parameters.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-3, 9, and 11 define over the art cited by the Examiner. Claim 4 and its dependent claims 5-8, 10, and 12 define over the art cited by the Examiner for one or more of the reasons set forth above regarding claim 1.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kentish et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,778,417) in view of Iwamoto et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,816,833). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 7 depends from 4. Applicant submits the arguments presented above regarding claims 1 and 4 apply here equally. Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 7 defines over the art cited by the Examiner.

NEW CLAIMS

Applicant has added claims 13-14 to provide varied scope of protection.

Claim 13 recites “[a] first control [that] allows a user to set values of, ... during the mixing process, a plurality of control parameters for controlling the mixing unit and ...

[that] allows a user to select a subset of the plurality of control parameters and stores the selected subset as authorization parameters.” Claim 13 further recites that “the mixing unit only assigns one or more control function, to the second control unit and in response to the authorization parameters, that operates to only allow a user to set a value of one or more of the authorization parameters.”

In contrast, Kentish at best appears to show that the panel (10) can set control parameters of the control processor (60C) and the signal processor (70) and has some assignable panel controls that allow a user to define their functions. Kentish, however, does not appear to disclose that the panel (10) further can allow a user to decide what functions can be assigned to another panel by allowing the user to restrict a subset of the control parameters and adjustable by the other panel.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that claim 13 and its dependent claim 14 define over the art cited by the Examiner.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office

Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Oct. 10, 2008_____

By: /Timothy D. MacIntyre/_____
Timothy D. MacIntyre
Reg. No.: 42,824

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

GAS/PFD/evm